



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

self-consciousness." I think most of the time McDougall is speaking of the latter, but this is not the only passage in which the confusion occurs. The two ideas certainly do not imply each other. Merely that individuals have an idea of their common nationality does not imply that the nation is the realization of an idea. Similarly I fail to understand the logic of the following passage which McDougall quotes with approval from Barker's *Political Thought in England*: "That [speaking of an Oxford college] group of minds, in virtue of the common substance of an uniting idea, is itself a group-mind" (p. 25). Does Mr. McDougall mean by the group-mind merely a group-of-minds? Then why use such confusing language?

I shall mention only one more source of confusion, and I am speaking now primarily of Part III. Mr. McDougall uses the terms racial and national too loosely. We find him arguing innate racial differences between nations, in spite of the fact that he makes it clear that most nations are a conglomeration of races. And conversely, he argues from national differences, which are for the most part cultural differences, to innate racial differences. Though this is a common confusion, one seldom finds it so thoroughly exploited.

My remarks are intended to suggest that the *Group Mind* is a contribution to idealistic philosophy rather than to collective psychology. The author appears to be interested not so much in clarifying the current confused ideas about group life, as in exploiting these confusions for the sake of a philosophy of mind and of progress. For this reason I make no apologies for reviewing at such length in a journal of philosophy a book on psychology written by a prominent modern philosopher!

HERBERT W. SCHNEIDER.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Annales de l'Institut supérieur de Philosophie. Tome IV. Année 1920. Louvain: Institut supérieur de Philosophie. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan. Pp. 624.

The University of Louvain, which had been one of the victims of Teutonic barbarity, comes back to the world with a new life, and offers to the student of medieval philosophy the fourth volume of the *Annales de l'Institut supérieur de Philosophie*.

It is a bulky volume of 624 pages, and consists of a certain number of essays of different lengths, the titles of which are the following: *Aristote et l'éducation*. *La Morale à Nicomaque*. *Remarques métaphysiques sur la causalité*. *La Morale kantienne et l'Eudémonisme*. *Pestalozzi et Herbart*. *La Philosophie française à la veille de la guerre*. *L'Œuvre d'art et la beauté*. *Le Droit*

international chrétien. Un sociologue catholique, Henri Lorin. L'Idée de Création. De quelques conditions de la Renaissance thomiste.

The first thing which strikes us when we go over these different essays is the number of pages devoted to the study of Aristotle. In point of fact, of the 624 pages of the volume, 218—that is to say, more than one third—is devoted to the study of the Stagirite. No special study is made of any other philosopher previous to the Christian era, although, as was to be expected, in the studies on Aristotle, Plato is often mentioned.

The scholastics of Louvain thereby seem to assert once more that it is to Aristotle we must trace back the scholastic philosophical system, and not to Plotinus, as François Picavet has been teaching for many years. In point of fact, Picavet's brilliant theory does not seem to have gained many adherents. It may be true to a great extent in so far as scholastic theology is concerned, but the philosophical principles of St. Thomas Aquinas are evidently to be traced back to Aristotle and not to Plotinus.

Of special interest is the treatise entitled "*Aristote et l'éducation*," work of the famous Hellenist Defourny, to whom we owe an excellent work on the economic and political teachings of Aristotle, published in the third volume of the *Annales*. In both of these works, M. Defourny penetrates deeply into the spirit of Aristotle and illuminates with a new light the life of ancient Greece.

A considerable part of the volume is devoted to modern philosophy. We have an essay on Kant, one on Pestalozzi and Herbart, and a short, but very illuminating article on French philosophy at the eve of the great war, in which the author, P. Nevé, makes a thorough analysis of the different elements to which the philosophy of Bergson can be traced back.

The treatise entitled *La Morale kantienne et l'Eudémonisme* is a masterpiece of reasoning and deep thought, and ought not to be neglected by any student of Kant. The author, C. Janssens, exposes in a clear and lucid way the well-known objections of Kant to Hedonism and appears as an irrefutable champion of Hedonism against the author of the *Critique of Practical Reason*.

Among the articles devoted to the exposition of the scholastic principles, we will mention the able essay on the conception of creation, written by A. D. Sertillanges. The scholastic conception of creation had already been exposed by the same writer as far back as 1907 in a work entitled *L'idée de création dans saint Thomas d'Aquin*, which the present work reproduces with very little change.

Both of these works are the ablest expositions of the Thomistic doctrine of creation with which we are acquainted.

We are almost surprised to notice that a volume which probably represents the work of the great neo-scholastic center during the past year does not study any scholastic philosopher except St. Thomas Aquinas. In point of fact, were it not that the medieval philosophers are incidentally mentioned in the article of J. Maritain on the Thomistic revival, we might suppose that St. Thomas was the only philosopher of the Middle Ages.

He is the greatest and the one whose influence has been most lasting but a serious study of the Middle Ages ought to embrace the different writers of that time in their historical setting. It ought to take into account the different elements which have influenced them, and to show how their philosophical principles have made out modern philosophy, and have built our own views of the world. It is in this fruitful and only scientific spirit that medieval philosophy is studied at the Sorbonne, under the able direction of M. François Picavet. In American universities, if scholastic philosophy is studied at all, it is as a mummified system of thought, dead for a long time, unconnected with the philosophy of our day. And thus Descartes appears to us as a creator, who built a system out of nothing, as the true father of modern thought, whereas Descartes is as decidedly a scholastic as St. Thomas Aquinas.

I do not mean that scholastic philosophy is studied at Louvain in such an unscientific spirit. The numerous volumes on medieval writers published by the Institut supérieur de Philosophie, and the able essays on Ockam which have just appeared in the *Revue Néo-scholastique* prove that such is not the case. We simply suggest that in a volume which seems to be representative of the work of the great neo-scholastic center, some study of that kind ought to have appeared.

J. L. PERRIER.

NEW YORK.

JOURNALS AND NEW BOOKS

SCIENTIA. May, 1921. *The Problem of the Variable Stars in its Present State* (pp. 341-344): J. G. HAGEN (Rome).—Most, and perhaps all, periodic variability in the light of stars is due to eclipse by dark companions. But variables of more than four months' period are so different in many respects from short period variables that this explanation is still doubtful in their case. *La contribution que les divers pays ont donnée aux progrès de la physique. I. Physique Newtonienne et Physique de Fresnel-Max-*